

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action marked "FINAL" and dated January 28, 2008 have been read and carefully considered by Applicants. In view of such comments, Applicants have amended the set of claims in the present Application as set forth hereinabove. In particular, independent claim 11 and also dependent claims 13, 14, 17, 19, 22-24, 29, and 30 have all been amended to better highlight the patentable differences of Applicants' proposed invention as compared to the prior art cited by Examiner in the Office Action. In amending these claims, however, Applicants maintain that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the present Application. Furthermore, Applicants have herein additionally canceled claims 20, 25, 26, and 28 and also added new claims 31-35 as set forth hereinabove. Claims 1-10, 18, 21, and 27 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 11-17, 19, 22-24, and 29-35 now remain pending in Applicants' present Application for Examiner's consideration.

At the present time, it is Applicants' good faith belief that the pending claims, as presented herein, are both novel and non-obvious in view of all known prior art and that the claims properly comply with all applicable statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully aver that the pending claims now place the present Application in a condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 11-17, 19, 22, 24, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious and therefore unpatentable by International Publication Number WO 00/07691, which was published for Yves Malecot *et al.* on February 17, 2000 (hereinafter "Malecot"), in view of United States Patent Number 3,233,737, which was issued to William H. Hultgren on February 8, 1966 ("Hultgren"). Also, in the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 11-17, 19, 20, 22-26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious and therefore

unpatentable by Malecot in view of United States Patent Number 3,970,557, which was issued to Stephen G. Shoup on July 20, 1976 ("Shoup").

In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 11, amended dependent claims 13, 14, 17, 19, 22-24, 29, and 30, canceled dependent claims 20, 25, 26, and 28, and added new claims 31-35 as set forth hereinabove. In general, proper subject matter support for so amending claims 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22-24, 29, and 30 can be found, for example, in specification paragraphs 0017-0022 and also in Figures 1 and 2 of the Application as originally filed by Applicants. Furthermore, proper subject matter support for newly added claims 31-35 can similarly be found, for example, in specification paragraphs 0017-0022 and Figures 1 and 2 as originally filed by Applicants.

In brief, the combination of Malecot and Hultgren does not render Applicants' claimed invention obvious, for neither Malecot nor Hultgren teaches an "oil filtering device" with a "spring" as now claimed by Applicants in independent claim 11 amended herein. (See amended independent claim 11 as set forth hereinabove.) Hultgren, in particular, specifically teaches against the incorporation of such a spring within a filter. (Hultgren, see column 2, lines 63-72; and see column 3, lines 1-2.)

Furthermore, the combination of Malecot and Shoup does not render Applicants' claimed invention obvious either, for neither Malecot nor Shoup teaches an "oil filtering device" with a filter closure member having a "valveless open bore" as now claimed by Applicants in independent claim 11 amended herein. Shoup, in stark contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, specifically teaches incorporating a spring-biased relief valve in a bypass bore of an oil filter. (Shoup, see column 2, lines 4-10; and see column 2, lines 21-28.)

In view of the above, Applicants now respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) claim rejections set forth in the Office Action and request that all such rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the claims as amended and also the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-17, 19, 22-24, and 29-35 properly comply with all statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's rejections in the Office Action be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for all claims 11-17, 19, 22-24, and 29-35.

Also, together with this Amendment, both a "Petition for an Extension of Time" (3 months) and a "Request for Continued Examination" (RCE) along with appropriate fees are being submitted. Receipt and entry thereof by Examiner is respectfully requested by Applicants.

Lastly, should Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 433-7200.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC



John A. Artz, Reg. No. 25,824
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5092
telephone: (248) 433-7200
facsimile: (248) 433-7274

Dated: July 28, 2008